



**ENGINEERING OPERATIONS COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
JULY 11, 2002 - 9:00 A.M.
EXECUTIVE CONFERENCE ROOM**

Present:	L. E. Tibbits	G. D. Taylor	J. D. Culp
	C. Roberts	M. VanPortFleet	J. D. O'Doherty
	T. Davies	T. Fudaly	S. Bower
Guests:	J. Friend	T. Anderson	J. Morena
	C. Bleech	R. Rizzo	T. Myers
	M. Bott	C. Mills	C. Libiran

OLD BUSINESS

1. Approval of the Minutes of the June 6, 2002, Meeting - L. E. Tibbits

Minutes of the June 6, 2002, meeting were approved.

2. Pavement Demonstration Program (See June 6, 2002, Minutes, New Business, Item 2) - S. Bower

The regions reported that the 2003 projects are too far along in the development process to switch to a demo project (scoping done, budget set, design underway, etc.). Changes at this point would increase cost and impact other projects. The Michigan Concrete Paving Association has now proposed projects using concrete whitetopping overlays as demo projects.

ACTION: The Pavement Selection Committee will review all region responses and bring recommendations to the EOC. The goal is to have demo projects in 2003 in both concrete and bituminous paving, if additional costs are reasonable.

The proposed guideline for demonstration projects is approved as noted. Steve Bower (Construction and Technology Division) will distribute the final version to the regions and road design engineers.

NEW BUSINESS

1. Sidewalk Ramp Detectable Warning - C. Libiran

FHWA has requested compliance with recent changes in the ADA law on all projects let after March 1, 2003. This includes the recent expiration of a suspension on the requirements

for detectable warnings (truncated domes) on sidewalk ramps. The final rule by the U.S. Access Board is still in the public comment phase. However, the implementation schedule precedes the completion of final rule making. It is believed that issues such as snow removal problems and heel snagging accident potential will arise in the public comment phase.

ACTION: Delay approval pending the issuance of a final rule by the U.S. Access Board. The Design Division will submit comments on the draft guidelines to AASHTO detailing MDOT's concerns with the truncated domes.

The Design Division will detail these actions in a memo back to FHWA.

2. **Revisions of *Memorial Highways and Bridges Signing Guidelines*, Section 8.8 - M. Bott**

Public Act 142 of 2001 went into affect October 26, 2001. The proposed modification brings our guidelines into compliance. There is a new requirement for the requesting party to cover all future maintenance costs. (New installations would require legislative approval and funding before MDOT would install them. Previous legislation prohibits the use of department funds for these signs.)

ACTION: The revised *Memorial Highways and Bridges Signing Guidelines* are approved.

3. **Revision of Three Sign Support Typical Plans - M. Bott**

Three typical details are recommended for revision, VIII-210 Wood Posts, VIII-820 Bolted Bridge Connection Types C and D, and VIII-830 Bolted Bridge Connection Types E and F.

ACTION: Approved.

4. ***Guidelines for Truck-Mounted Attenuator Use on Construction Projects* - J. Grossklaus, M. Bott, and T. Myers**

These guidelines have been reviewed by the regions and some issues still remain. Once EOC approval of the guidelines is received, a Bureau of Highway Instructional Memorandum will be sent out and they will be added to the *Design Guidelines*.

Thom Davies stated the regions have not resolved all issues yet and recommend further review. Steve Earl (Grand Region) has additional questions on cost and use he would like answered prior to the approval.

ACTION: Finalize the review before approval, addressing all region concerns. Areas of maintenance use should be addressed in the guidelines as well, recognizing that not all maintenance operations would require them. The Construction

and Technology Division (Jeff Grossklaus) will coordinate this review with their liaison region engineers (Randy VanPortfliet and Steve Earl).

5. **Revision of *Guidelines for the Use of Permanent Raised Pavement Markers* - T. Myers and J. Morena**

The revised guidelines and pictures showing problems noted statewide were distributed. The major change in the guidelines is to eliminate the raised pavement marker program for general use due to the difficulty and expense of maintaining the lenses in working order. (It would require \$4 million to bring the system back to working order.)

ACTION: The Traffic and Safety Division will work through their region engineer liaisons on a review of the proposed guidelines. The draft guidelines will then be revised and returned to EOC for approval. Until that time, a moratorium will be placed on the use of raised pavement markers for projects to be let after September 2002. The Traffic and Safety Division will prepare a memo noting the moratorium and distribute it to all designers.

6. **Other States' Standard for Concrete Pavement Design - R. Rizzo, J. LaVoy, and S. Bower**

Information was supplied by FHWA summarizing state DOTs' use of concrete pavement types. Both Michigan and Ohio continue to design jointed reinforced concrete pavements in some instances. Twenty-four states were reported as using the jointed plain concrete pavement design exclusively. MDOT will continue to evaluate their concrete pavement design standards.

(Signed Copy on File at C&T)

Jon W. Reincke, Secretary
Engineering Operations Committee

JDC:JWR:kat

cc:	EOC Members	J. Ruszkowski	T. E. Myers	M. Nystrom (AUC)
	Region Engineers	R. D. Till	T. Phillips	R. J. Risser, Jr. (MCPA)
	G. J. Rosine	C. Libiran	D. L. Smiley	A. C. Milo (MRBA)
	C. T. Maki	M. Frierson	K. Peters	J. Becsey (MAPA)
	J. Friend	C. W. Whiteside	T. L. Nelson	D. Hollingsworth (MCA)
	T. Anderson	L. Stornant	J. Steele (FHWA)	M. Newman (MAA)
	R. J. Lippert, Jr.	K. Rothwell	J. Murner (MRPA)	